



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/147,520 02/22/99 TOMOMATSU

R 2421-0331-2X

EXAMINER

MMC2/0713

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT  
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY  
FOURTH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON VA 22202

ROSENBERGER, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2877

DATE MAILED:

07/13/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**09/147,520**Applicant(s)  
**TOMOMATSU**Examiner  
**Richard Rosenberger**Art Unit  
**2877**

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED Jun 12, 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See attached sheet.


4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-16
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
11. ☐ Other:

1. The amendment filed 12 June 2001 under 37 CFR 1.116 in reply to the final rejection has been considered but is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance and will not be entered because it raises new issues which would require further consideration and/or search. The limitation that "a light detection extent in the surface of the object" is controlled "by changing a size of said opening of said slit and a magnification of said objective lens" has been added to some of the claims (such as claims 5, 11 and 12). This feature has not been previously claimed and has not been previously considered.

2. The arguments filed 12 June 2001 argue that the art, the *Shiraishi* reference, does not show that the size of the slit is changeable (remarks, page 6, lines 18-19) as is now claimed in independent claims 1 and 9. This is, however, not correct. Claim 1 calls for "a slit provided in an optical path between the objective lens [27 in *Shiraishi*] and said light detection means [28 in the reference]", and the amendment would add "wherein a size of said slit is changeable". *Shiraishi* clearly discloses that the size of the slit 26 is changeable; in column 19, lines 38-41, the reference says "the system is arranged such that the numerical aperture of the image-forming optical system can be changed as desired by the aperture stop 26", which discloses varying the size of the aperture stop.

3. As the reference teaches what would be added to claim 1 by the proposed amendment, the application would not be allowable even if the amendment were entered and the addition to claims 5, 11, and 12 of "by changing a size of said opening of said slit and a magnification of said objective lens" were found to be allowable.

Richard Rosenberger  
(703) 308-4804  
July 12, 2001



Richard A. Rosenberger  
Primary Examiner